

## Chapter 5

### Implementation of Nevada's 2003 SCORP

---

***I**mplementation of Nevada's 2003 SCORP will occur by a variety of actions taken in the State of Nevada by various entities. This chapter will focus briefly on opportunities that have the potential to implement the actions presented in chapter 1 of this plan. Examples of actions and programs offering potential opportunities to implement this plan include:*

- *Top five actions cited in chapter 1 of this plan.*
- *Land and Water Conservation Fund Grants Program*
- *Recreational Trails Program Grants*
- *Nevada's 2004 Statewide Trails Plan*
- *Nevada Wetland Priority Conservation Plan (NWPCP)*
- *Question 1 bond issue passed by Nevada voters in November 2002*
- *Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act*
- *Coordination between various federal, state, and local governmental agencies; non-profit and commercial entities, and outdoor recreation user organizations.*

---

#### **Top Five Actions to Address Outdoor Recreation Issues**

Table 5.1 lists the top five actions recommended in chapter 1 to address the outdoor recreation issues. These top five actions were selected based on the weighted score provided by the 132 participants in the outdoor recreation issues and actions surveys conducted to develop this plan. Two of the top ranked actions are from issue # 1, two from issue # 2, and one from issue # 4. The remaining issues—3, 5, 6, 7, and 8—had no actions with scores ranked in the top five actions. Please see chapter 1 and appendix A for details on the weighting and ranking process.

If implemented, these five actions could accomplish a great deal to meet the outdoor recreation needs in Nevada. In themselves, these five actions contain the basics to form elements to produce an outdoor recreation action plan.

#### **Land and Water Conservation Fund Grants Program**

The Nevada Division of State Parks bears the primary responsibility for the administration and success of grants awarded under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Grants Program, including performance by third parties under sub-agreements made by the State to accomplish project objectives (National Park Service. 1991, page i). "The L&WCF program provides

matching grants to States, and through the States to local governments, for the acquisition and development of public

outdoor recreation areas and facilities” (National Park Service. 1991, page 1)

<b>Table 5.1</b>			
<b>Top Five Actions Recommended to Address Outdoor Recreation Issues in Nevada</b>			
<b>Rank</b>	<b>Recommended Action<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Outdoor Recreation Issue<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
<b>1</b>	Encourage user groups to participate on a volunteer basis and implement use fees when necessary to maintain or prevent resource degradation. Retain the majority of fees in the area where they are collected, but establish a general fund to help areas that need help but do not generate enough to cover determined needs.	# 4: Balancing the protection of Nevada’s natural, cultural, and scenic resources with users.	208
<b>2</b>	Propose several funding mechanisms to governor and legislature along with statistics on population, surveys, etc.—possibilities: 1/8 cent gas tax, green sticker, 1/8 cent sales tax, OHV tax, recreation gear (equipment) tax.	# 2 Funding parks and recreation	205
<b>3</b>	Identify lands that should be maintained for public use and develop a process to prioritize acquisition of these lands (similar to the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act but for the whole state).	# 1 Public access to public lands for diverse outdoor recreation.	195
<b>4</b>	As much property as possible should be acquired by appropriate land agencies for open space and to provide and insure access to public lands and recreational resources. Developers and developing lands need to provide for and maintain existing and future access and easements to public lands.	# 1 Public access to public lands for diverse outdoor recreation.	185
<b>5</b>	Need to consider adopting a "Green Sticker" program similar to the one in California that supports the California OHV Commission. The recreation industry and users should be willing to pay a small fee for additional funding.	# 2 Funding parks and recreation.	157

Sources: <sup>1</sup>DeLoney, James A. 2002. *Nevada’s Outdoor Recreation Actions Survey* (unpublished research). Planning and Development Section, Nevada Division of State Parks. Carson City, Nevada.

<sup>2</sup>DeLoney, James A. 2001. *Nevada’s Outdoor Recreation Issues Survey* (unpublished research). Planning and Development Section, Nevada Division of State Parks. Carson City, Nevada.

Administration of the L&WCF grants program by the Nevada Division of State Parks is one of the key actions taken in Nevada to implement Nevada’s 2003

SCORP. Since the inception of the L&WCF grant program in 1965, some 275 outdoor recreation projects have been funded in Nevada totaling \$36

million in federal funding. Since the L&WCF Grant Program is a 50/50 matching federal grants program, these 275 projects represent a minimum of \$72 million to fund outdoor recreation in Nevada. State agencies and local governmental entities will continue to use L&WCF moneys to improve the quantity and quality of outdoor recreation opportunities across the State of Nevada.

Nevada's 2003 Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) is a component of Nevada's 2003 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). The OPSP describes the procedures used by the Nevada Division of State Parks to process Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant applications for federal L&WCF grant moneys to acquire and develop parks and recreation areas in Nevada.

One important element of the OPSP is the criteria used by the NDSP staff to score projects. Projects are ranked based on the scores to present recommendations for funding to the Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources (NABNR). The NABNR determines which projects are funded. Requests for funding usually exceed the federal funds available. If Congress appropriates funding to the states at the same level of funding as they did in FY 2002-2003, Nevada will receive approximately \$5-\$8 million in federal L&WCF moneys during the next five years Nevada's 2003 OPSP is applicable. Thus, the OPSP identifies the process and criteria that will determine how the federal L&WCF grant moneys are allocated over the next five years. Since the L&WCF Grant Program is a 50/50 matching grant

program, the OPSP will be instrumental in the expenditure of \$10-\$16 million spent on the acquisition and development of parks and recreation areas from FY 2003-2007.

The 2003 OPSP is based on the 8 outdoor recreation issues and 59 actions presented in Nevada's 2003 SCORP.

Table 5.1 presents the top five actions based on the weighted scores.

### **Recreational Trails Grants Program**

The Nevada Division of State Parks has administered the Recreational Trails Grants Program for the State of Nevada since the inception of the program in 1993. Congress did not appropriate any funds to the states in 1994 and 1995. Since the inception of the program, Nevada has received \$3.5 million in federal funds to develop and maintain trails across the state. Currently, Nevada receives about \$660,000 annually from the federal RecTrails Grants Program. Since the program will expire at the end of the federal fiscal year 2003, Congressional approval is required for its renewal.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) administers the National RecTrail Program (RecTrails Program or RTP) at the federal level. The program is designed to expand the quantity and quality of recreational trails in America.

Two of the top ranked issues in this plan are directly related to trails and pathways. The top ranked issue, public access to public lands, is extremely important to all sectors of trail users. The third ranked issue in this plan,

recreational trails and pathways, illustrates the popularity of participation in trails activities presented in chapter 3. Grants available through the RecTrails Grants Program will be administered to meet a portion of the demand for trails presented in this plan.

Thus, the Nevada Division of State Parks has administered almost \$40 million in federal grants to provide outdoor recreation opportunities in Nevada. While this amount is certainly significant, Nevada ranked 50<sup>th</sup> out of 50 states in annual per capita federal funding in the year 2000 according to U.S. Department of Commerce data (2000).

### **Nevada's 2004 Statewide Trails Plan**

One of the requirements for states to participate in the federal RecTrails Grants Program is the development and maintenance of a Statewide Trails Plan (STP). The Nevada Division of State Parks is responsible for the development of the State Trails Plan for Nevada. The NDSP has scheduled to complete the development of this plan by December 31, 2004.

One component of the Nevada Statewide Trails Plan is a Statewide Trails Inventory (STI). The NDSP has already initiated the STI through coordination with federal agencies in Nevada. Trails issues and actions will be identified for presentation in the STP, along with participation data on trails.

### **Nevada Wetland Priority Conservation Plan (NWPCP)**

SCORP's must contain a wetlands priority component consistent with Section 303 of the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-645) (National Park Service. 1991, Page 3). "In October 2002, the Nevada Natural Heritage Program (NNHP) took on the development of the Nevada Wetland Information System and GIS (NWIS). At the same time, the Nevada Natural Heritage Program (NNHP) began preparation of the Nevada Wetland Priority Conservation Plan (NWPCP). Funding for this effort comes from the Environmental Protection Agency's Wetland Grant Program to stimulate wetland protection and management by state agencies." (Clemmer. January 7, 2003).

The NWPCP will fulfill and exceed the state's eligibility requirements to complete the "wetlands priority component" cited in the paragraph above. The Nevada Natural Heritage Program has requested 15 entities to partnership in this extensive effort, including all major federal and state agencies in Nevada, The Nature Conservancy, Nevada Intermountain West Joint Venture, Desert Research Institute, and the Nevada Indian Commission.

Nevada's one and only effort to develop a SCORP wetlands priority component was completed as an Addendum to the SCORP in October 1988. This plan was titled **Nevada's Wetlands—An Element of Recreation in Nevada, 1987 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan** (Nevada Division of State Parks. October 1988).

Actions thus far to develop the Nevada Wetland Priority Conservation Plan (NWPCP) have increased the awareness of Nevada's 2003 SCORP among state and federal agencies. Coordination planned to develop the Wetlands Plan will continue to bring selected federal, state, and local agencies together to address wetlands issues that may directly or indirectly impact outdoor recreation in Nevada. The preservation of wetlands impacts the state's water resources, wildlife, vegetation, and other natural resources vital to various outdoor recreation activities, such as fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing, etc.

### **Nevadans Approve \$200 Million Bond Issue to Protect Natural Resources**

The 2001 Nevada State Legislature authorized the placement of a proposal to issue bonds for conservation and resource protection on the 2002 statewide ballot (Assembly Bill No. 9). On November 5, 2002, Nevada voters approved, by a 59% to 41% margin (Heller 2002), the ballot proposal to issue bonds in the amount of

\$200,000,000 for conservation and resource protection (Question 1). This landmark environmental decision is designed to:

- Preserve water quality.
- Protect open space, lakes, rivers, wetlands, and wildlife habitat.
- Restore and improve parks, recreational areas, and historic and cultural resources.

The overwhelming majority of these funds will finance projects that directly or indirectly address the 8 outdoor recreation issues cited in Nevada's 2003 SCORP, and many of the 59 actions. Table 5.2 and 5.3 present a synopsis of the bond issue project categories.

Of the 17 counties in Nevada, five counties (Carson City, Clark, Douglas, Storey, and Washoe) approved Question 1. The remaining 12 counties voted "no" (Heller 2002).

Question 1 appeared on the ballot on November 5, 2002, as follows (Barker 2002):

#### **State Questions**

##### **Question No. 1**

#### **Proposal to Issue Bonds for Conservation and Resource Protection**

Assembly Bill No. 9 of the 17<sup>th</sup> Special Session

CONDENSATION (ballot question)

Shall the State of Nevada be authorized to issue general obligation bonds in an amount not to exceed \$200 million in order to preserve water quality; protect open space, lakes, rivers, wetlands, and wildlife habitat; and restore and improve parks, recreational areas, and historic and cultural resources?

Yes.....☐

No.....☐

**Table 5.2**  
**Synopsis of Nevada's 2002 Conservation and Resource Protection Bond Issue**

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
Division of State Parks	\$ 27,000,000*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To acquire real or personal property for parks and recreation</li> <li>To support extraordinary capital improvements and renovations in state parks</li> </ul>
Division of Wildlife	\$ 27,500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To acquire real or personal property to enhance, protect, and manage wildlife and wildlife habitat</li> <li>To develop and renovate facilities and habitats for fish and wildlife</li> </ul>
Division of State Lands	\$ 65,500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide grants for state agencies, local governments, or qualifying private nonprofit organizations for various programs including recreational trails, urban parks, habitat conservation, open spaces, and general natural resource protection projects</li> <li>To be administered by the Nevada Division of State Lands</li> </ul>
Las Vegas Spring Preserve	\$ 25,000,000**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For planning, development, design and construction</li> <li>To provide wildlife habitat</li> </ul>
Clark County	\$ 10,000,000**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop Clark County Wetlands Park</li> <li>To divert water, control erosion, and improve existing wetlands</li> <li>To create new wetlands</li> <li>To acquire land and water rights</li> <li>To provide recreational facilities</li> <li>To provide parking for access to park</li> </ul>
Department of Cultural Affairs	\$ 35,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To establish a museum at the Las Vegas Springs Preserve</li> <li>To create new exhibits and move exhibits from other locations to the new museum</li> </ul>
Washoe County	\$ 10,000,000**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To restore and enhance the Truckee River Corridor</li> </ul>
<b>Total Bond Dollars</b>	<b>\$200,000,000</b>	
<b>Total Matching Dollars**</b>	<b>\$ 22,500,000</b>	
<b>Bond Total Plus Match</b>	<b>\$222,500,000</b>	

Source: Compiled by James A. DeLoney, Planning and Development Section, NDSP, April 2003, from Handout titled **Fact Sheet—Proposition 1 Overview** by Pam Wilcox, Administrator, Nevada Division of State Lands. February 13, 2003, 6:00 p.m., at a Public Hearing at the Community Center, Carson City, Nevada, and information posted on the Nevada Division of State Lands website at <http://www.lands.nv.gov/program/Q1facts.htm> on August 20, 2003.

Notes: \*No match required, however, the Nevada Division of State Parks will attempt to match up to 50% of the total cost of selected projects with federal Land and Water Conservation Fund grant moneys available to Nevada over the years.

\*\*Requires 50% match.

<p align="center"><b>Table 5.3</b>  <b>Nevada's 2002 Conservation and Resource Protection Bond Issue—Funds Administered by the Nevada Division of State Lands, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources</b></p>		
<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
Non-Profit Conservation Organizations	\$15,000,000*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To acquire land and water for environmental protection purposes</li> </ul>
Local Entities in Churchill, Douglas, Lyon, or Carson City Counties	\$10,000,000*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To restore and enhance the Carson River Corridor</li> </ul>
Churchill, Douglas, Lyon, or Carson City Counties	\$ 5,000,000*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop the Lake Tahoe path system</li> </ul>
State Agencies, Counties, Municipalities, or Qualifying Private Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 7,250,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To construct regional trails</li> </ul>
	\$ 5,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To acquire land and water for urban parks and green belts</li> </ul>
Rural Counties, and Municipalities	\$ 3,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop habitat conservation plans</li> </ul>
	\$ 250,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop open space plans</li> </ul>
Counties and municipalities	\$20,000,000**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To acquire land and water to protect wildlife habitat, sensitive or unique vegetation, historic and cultural resources, riparian corridors, floodplains, wetlands, and other environmental values pursuant to an adopted open space plan</li> </ul>
<b>Total Bond Dollars</b>	<b>\$65,500,000</b>	
<b>Total Matching Dollars***</b>	<b>\$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000</b>	
<b>Bond Total Plus Match***</b>	<b>\$85,500,000 to \$90,500,000</b>	

Source: Compiled by James A. DeLoney, Planning and Development Section, NDSP, April 2003, from Handout titled **Fact Sheet—Proposition 1 Overview** by Pam Wilcox, Administrator, Nevada Division of State Lands. February 13, 2003, 6:00 p.m., at a Public Hearing at the Community Center, Carson City, Nevada, and information posted on the Nevada Division of State Lands website at <http://www.lands.nv.gov/program/Q1facts.htm> on August 20, 2003.

Notes:

\*Requires 50% match.

\*\*In counties with more than 100,000 population, the county or municipality must match 50% of an acquisition. In counties with less than 100,000 population, the county or municipality must match 25% of an acquisition. Clark and Washoe Counties are the only counties with populations more than 100,000.

\*\*\*Match required for the \$20,000,000 will vary between \$5,000,000 (25% of \$20,000,000—assumes all of the \$20,000,000 is requested by and awarded to counties with populations less than 100,000 people) to \$10,000,000 (50% of \$20,000,000—assumes all of the \$20,000,000 is requested by and awarded to counties with populations greater than 100,000).

Table 5.4 summarizes the total impact that the \$200,000,000 bond issue will have on parks and recreation in Nevada. Figures in table 5.4 assume that all of the

available bond money will be requested. The total impact could range between \$242,000,000 and \$247,500,000.

<p align="center"><b>Table 5.4</b>  <b>Question I Open Space Bond Initiative Passed by Nevada Voters</b>  <b>in November 2002</b></p>	
Total Bond Dollars	\$200,000,000
Total Matching Dollars	\$42,500,000 to \$47,500,000
Bond Total Plus Match	\$242,500,000 to \$247,500,000

Source: Compiled by James A. DeLoney, Planning and Development Section, NDSP, April 2003, from Handout titled **Fact Sheet—Proposition 1 Overview** by Pam Wilcox, Administrator, Nevada Division of State Lands. February 13, 2003, 6:00 p.m., at a Public Hearing at the Community Center, Carson City, Nevada.

## Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA)

One of the greatest boosts to implement the 2003 SCORP is Public Law 105-263, cited as the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998, or SNPLMA.

“The Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA) became law in October, 1998. It allows the Bureau of Land Management to sell public land within a specific boundary around Las Vegas, Nevada. The revenue derived from land sales is split between the State of Nevada General Education Fund (5%), the Southern Nevada Water Authority (10%), and a special account available to the Secretary of the Interior for:

- Acquiring environmentally sensitive land in the State of Nevada.
- Capital improvements at the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, the Desert National Wildlife Refuge, the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area and other areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management

in Clark County, and the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area;

- Developing a multi-species habitat conservation plan in Clark County;
- Funding the development of parks, trails, and natural areas in Clark County, Nevada, pursuant to a cooperative agreement with a unit of local government.
- Conservation Initiatives on Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, administered by the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture.

“Other provisions in the SNPLMA direct certain land sale and acquisition procedures, direct the BLM to convey title to land in the McCarran Airport noise zone to Clark County, and provide for the sale of land for affordable housing.

“This website (<http://www.nv.blm.gov/snplma>) is the place to learn about the SNPLMA, and find out what is going on with land sales, acquisitions, and other aspects of its implementation. If you are having trouble finding what you need, or have



suggestions on how we might improve our site, please let us know by using the “contact us” option above, or by calling 702-515-5114.”

(<http://www.nv.blm.gov/snplma/default.asp>).”

Table 5.5 presents costs of projects funded for rounds 1 through 3. Projects are listed by capital improvements; land; the Multiple Species Habitat

Conservation Plan (for Clark County); and parks, trails, and natural areas

Table 5.5 lists projects totaling \$595,285,305 for use to improve outdoor recreation opportunities in Nevada. The majority of the funds will be spent in Clark County. Detailed information about the projects approved for these expenditures can be found on the BLM website at

<http://www.nv.blm.gov/snplma/financial.asp>.

*Table 5.5*  
**Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act—Projects Funded That Implement Issues and Actions Cited in Nevada’s  
2003 Outdoor Recreation Plan**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Capital Improvements—Round 1</b>	<b>Amount</b>
1	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Kyle Canyon Visitor Center	\$ 159,000
2	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Boulder Beach Sanitation	\$ 495,000
3	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Red Rock Visitor Center Exhibit Upgrades	\$ 70,000
4	FWS	Desert NWR Complex	Habitat Restoration	\$ 500,000
5	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Oliver Ranch Feasibility Study	\$ 100,000
6	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Lee Canyon Water System	\$ 527,000
7	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Lakeshore Pull-Out Improvements	\$ 390,000
8	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Mack’s Canyon Trail-head	\$ 615,000
9	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	River Mountain Loop Trail—Boulder Beach	\$ 450,000
10	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Fletcher View Campground	\$ 508,000
11	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Boulder Shoreline Fishing Improvements	\$ 285,000
12	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Mary Jane Falls and Trail Canyon Trail-head Improvements	\$ 262,000
13	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Boulder Beach Picnic Area Improvements	\$ 399,000
14	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Dolomite Campground Toilets	\$ 280,000
			<b>Total Capital Improvements—Round 1</b>	<b>\$5,040,000</b>
			<b>Capital Improvements—Round 2</b>	
0	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Water Safety Center	\$ 400,000
1	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Kyle Canyon Visitor Center Lead Paint Remediation	\$ 350,000
2	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Red Rock Visitor Center Exhibit Upgrades—Phase 2	\$ 500,000
3	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Universal Accessibility For Physically-Challenged	\$ 240,000
4	FWS	Ash Meadows	Restore Longstreet Cabin (historical structure)	\$ 90,000
5	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Red Spring Restoration and Interpretation	\$ 150,000
6	FWS	Desert NWR	Replace obsolete phone line at Com Creek	\$ 100,000
7	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Rehabilitate public restrooms at Alan Bible Visitor Center	\$ 58,000
8	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Extension of the Historical Trail to Hoover Dam	\$ 495,000

**Table 5.5** (continued)

Priority	Nominated By	Location	Capital Improvements—Round 2	Amount
9	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Red Rock Wild Horse and Burro Herd Management Area Water Wells and Fencing	\$ 190,000
10	FWS	Desert NWR & Ash Meadows	Volunteer Housing	\$ 306,000
11	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Construct Hemenway Group Campground—Phase 1	\$ 365,000
12	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Enhance Shoreline Access/Protect Habitat at Stewart Point	\$ 250,000
13	FWS	Desert NWR	Equipment shelters	\$ 400,000
14	BLM	Gold Butte	Construct Gold Butte Field Station	\$ 300,000
15	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Prepare sites for installation of wayside exhibits	\$ 198,000
16	FWS	Desert NWR	Replace boundary and interpretive signs	\$ 226,000
17	BLM	Indian Springs	Cactus Springs and Bitter Springs Restoration	\$ 12,000
18	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Replace boat ramp	\$ 317,000
19	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Improve trail head to Wetlands Trail, River Mountain Loop and Bluffs Trail	\$ 289,000
20	BLM	Sunrise SRMA	Fence bear poppy restoration areas	\$ 100,000
21	FWS	Desert NWR	Rehabilitate Mormon Wells Picnic Area	\$ 320,000
40	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Protection of Museum Collections/Stabilization of Historical Structure	\$ 336,950
			<b>Total Capital Improvements—Round 2</b>	<b>\$5,987,950</b>
			<b>Capital Improvements—Round 3</b>	
1	BLM	Not available	Oliver Ranch Feasibility Study-Phase 2	\$ 100,000
2	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Replace Boat Ramps - Phase 3	\$2,986,200
3	BLM	Sunrise Mountain Management Area	Sunrise Management Area Trail System	\$ 260,000
4	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Mitigate Emergency Water Levels	\$ 956,000
5	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Campground/Fire Station Development—Red Rock	\$1,354,000
6	BLM	Logandale	Logandale Trail System	\$ 88,000
7	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Boulder Beach Water Safety Center—Phase 2	\$ 405,000
8	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Kyle Interim Visitor Center Interpretive Displays	\$ 100,000

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Capital Improvements—Round 3</b>	<b>Amount</b>
9	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Replace Floating Restrooms	\$ 489,600
10	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Lake Mead Hatchery Visitor Center Renovation	\$ 550,000
11	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Protection of Natural and Cultural Resources	\$ 200,000
12	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Segment 22 - River Mountains Loop Trail	\$ 490,500
13	BLM	Nellis Dunes	Recreation Improvements at Nellis Dunes	\$ 650,000
14	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Kyle Canyon Admin/Visitor Complex—1	\$ 378,000
15	FS	Tecopa Charcoal Kilns Heritage Site, Wheeler Wash area	Tecopa Charcoal Kiln Restoration	\$ 150,000
16	BLM	10 miles south of Mesquite	Devils Throat Viewing Platform	\$ 100,000
17	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Fletcher View & Kyle RV Camp—Phase 2	\$ 597,000
18	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Spring Mountain NRA Sign/Low Power Radio	\$ 440,000
19	BLM	Not available	Cottonwood Valley Trails Network Modification	\$ 750,000
20	FS	Not available	Desert View/Cold War Memorial	\$ 475,000
21	BLM	SRMA's Las Vegas District	National Scenic Byways Kiosk/Interpretive Panels	\$ 150,000
22	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Historic Railroad Trail	\$ 265,000
23	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Red Rock Horse/Burro Fencing—Phase 2	\$ 699,800
24	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Upper Kyle Canyon Day Use Complex	\$ 465,000
25	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Kyle Guard Station Barracks	\$ 289,000
26	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Renovate Pyramid Island Causeway	\$2,640,014
27	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Replace deteriorated floating restrooms	\$ 385,000
28	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Rehabilitate picnic shelters	\$ 378,000
29	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Hemenway Group Campground—Phase 2	\$ 485,000
30	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Plan, design and produce kiosks	\$ 190,000
31	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Replace back-country toilets	\$ 405,000
32	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Pave Boulder Beach shoreline—Phase 1	\$ 487,000
33	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Parking lot for Echo Bay—Phase 1	\$ 487,000
34	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Replace asphalt roads and campsite pads	\$ 630,000
35	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Rehabilitate picnic facilities	\$ 398,000

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Capital Improvements—Round 3</b>	<b>Amount</b>
36	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Replace tables and grills in picnic area	\$ 482,000
37	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Pave Boulder Beach Shoreline—Phase 2	\$ 461,000
38	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Hemenway Group Campground—Phase 3	\$ 455,000
39	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Parking lot for Echo Bay—Phase 2	\$ 425,000
40	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Replace inner section of Government Dock	\$ 461,000
41	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Provide solar lighting at launch	\$ 60,000
42	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Government Boating Repair/Aids to Navigation Complex	\$ 825,000
43	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Parking lot for Echo Bay—Echo 3	\$ 480,000
44	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Parking lot for Echo Bay—Phase 4	\$ 483,000
			<b>Total Capital Improvements—Round 3</b>	<b>\$24,005,114</b>
			<b>Capital Improvements—Round 4</b>	
1	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Oliver Ranch Science School Complex and Wild Horse & Burro Facility	\$ 22,405,998
2	FS	Spring Mountains NRA at Lower Kyle Canyon	Kyle Canyon Administrative & Visitor Center Complex—Phase 2	\$ 7,026,000
3	FWS	Moapa Valley NWR	Moapa Dace Viewing Chamber	\$ 350,000
4	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Red Springs Restoration and Interpretation—Phase 2	\$ 1,500,000
5	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Reconstruct Failing Launch Ramps—Phase 2	\$ 2,040,000
6	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Reconstruct Failing Launch Ramps—Phase 3	\$ 2,340,000
7	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Planning, Architecture and Engineering Design for Red Rock Canyon NCA	\$ 2,400,000
8	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Construction of the Red Rock Canyon NCA Administrative and Visitor Center Complex	\$ 12,000,000
9	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Infrastructure & Upgrades for Red Rock Canyon NCA	\$ 5,000,000

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Capital Improvements—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
10	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Lake Mead Fish Hatchery Visitor Center Exhibit Renovation—Phase 2	\$ 550,000
11	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Redevelop Visitor Facilities & Install Flash Flood Hazard Protection—Willow Beach	\$ 9,587,000
12	FWS	Moapa Valley NWR	Habitat Restoration at Moapa	\$ 300,000
13	FWS	Desert National Wildlife Range	Analysis, Planning & Design for the Administrative and Visitor Center Complex—Phase One	\$ 3,000,000
14	FWS	Desert National Wildlife Range	Construction & Implementation of the Administrative and Visitor Center Complex—Phase Two	\$12,000,000
15	FWS	Desert National Wildlife Range	Archaeological Excavation near Corn Creek Field Station	\$ 120,000
16	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA at Logandale-Overton area	Old Spanish Trail/Mormon Road Interpretive Kiosks and Marker System	\$ 228,000
17	FWS	Desert National Wildlife Range	Public Use Facilities and Habitat Enhancement	\$ 110,000
18	BLM	1-15 Logandale Interchange	Logandale Fire Station—Completion of Fire Station Complex	\$ 1,092,500
19	BLM	Goodsprings Area	Bat Gates for Hazardous Mine Sites	\$ 60,500
20	FWS	Desert National Wildlife Range	Replace School Springs Refugium and Construct Additional Backup Point of Rocks. Refugium at Amargosa Pupfish Station at Ash Meadows NWR	\$ 200,000
21	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Red Rock Canyon Campground Expansion and Completion of Fire Station Utilities	\$ 8,052,750
22	FWS	Desert NWR & Moapa Valley NWR	Boundary Fencing	\$ 600,000
23	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Upgrade Canoe/Raft Launch Area Below Hoover Dam	\$ 275,000
24	FS	Spring Mountains NRA at Lee Canyon	Blue Tree/Sawmill Trail System Development	\$ 178,700

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Capital Improvements—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
25	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Interpretive Signs & Displays	\$ 230,400
26	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	ORV Barriers and Habitat Restoration	\$ 564,000
27	FWS	Desert National Wildlife Range	Black Canon Interpretation and Water Delivery System Repair at Pahrnagat NWR	\$ 230,000
28	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Lee Canyon Meadow Rehabilitation	\$1,250,000
29	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Emergency Improvements for Continued Low-Water Operation of Lake Mead Facilities—Phase 2	\$ 720,000
30	FWS	Desert National Wildlife Range	Campground Rehabilitation and Improvements at Pahrnagat NWR	\$ 100,000
31	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Rehabilitate and Upgrade Campgrounds—Las Vegas Bay & Boulder Beach	\$2,325,600
32	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Trail Enhancement—Animal Proof Trash Receptacles	\$ 66,000
33	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Upgrade Primary Power Supply, Echo Bay & Overton Beach	\$ 750,000
34	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Rehabilitate and Upgrade Picnic Facilities, Parkwide	\$3,480,000
35	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Improve Safety of Facilities	\$1,800,000
36	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Waysides, Kiosks, and Interpretive Panels	\$ 192,000
37	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Refurbish Original Hoover Dam Exhibit Center	\$ 538,200
38	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	West Side Resource Enhancement Barriers	\$ 36,000
39	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Upgrade Park Infrastructure	\$2,160,000
40	FS	Spring Mountains NRA at Upper Deer Creek Wash	Deer Creek Water System Construction	\$1,021,000
			<b>Total Capital Improvements—Round 4</b>	<b>\$106,879,648</b>
			<b>Total Capital Improvements—Rounds 1, 2, 3, and 4</b>	<b>\$141,517,712</b>

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Land Acquisitions—Round 1</b>	<b>Amount</b>
1	BOR & NPS	Virgin River 1	Virgin River 1	\$ 288,000
2	FWS	Desert NWR	Moapa Valley NWR	\$ 1,300,000
3	FWS	Desert NWR	Ash Meadows ALC	\$ 495,000
4	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Mummy Mountain	\$ 1,200,000
5	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Tres Piedras	\$ 6,000,000
6	BLM	Railroad Valley	Lockes Ranch	\$ 1,400,000
7	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Lady of the Snows	\$ 2,028,525
8	BLM	Washoe Lake NW	Casey Ranch	\$ 4,000,000
9	BLM	Carson River near Dayton	Rolling A Ranch	\$ 7,000,000
10	FWS	Desert NWR	Ash Meadows Garner	\$ 160,000
11	FWS	Sheldon NWR	Idaho Canyon Estill	\$ 210,000
			<b>Total Land Acquisitions—Round 1</b>	<b>\$24,081,525</b>
	<b>Acquired By</b>		<b>Land Acquisitions—Round 2</b>	\$ 9,500,000
1	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Torino Ranch	\$ 1,200,000
2	BLM	Truckee River near Tracey	102 Ranch	\$ 2,000,000
3	BLM	Muddy River near Moapa	Perkins Ranch	\$ 1,500,000
4	FS	Washoe Valley	Casey Property	\$ 2,000,000
5	BLM	Virgin River	Virgin River 2	\$ 5,200,000
6	FS	Jack's Valley SWMA	Schneider Property	\$ 9,500,000
7	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Church & Associates Properties	\$ 153,000
8	BLM	Frenchman-Sunrise Mountain Area	Sunrise Mountain UNLV	\$ 2,750,000
9	BLM	Carson River	Carson River Properties	\$ 1,300,000
10	BLM	Virgin River	Tran Property	\$ 160,000
11	BLM	Virgin River	Hughes Property	\$ 400,000
12	BLM	Virgin River	Bunker Property	\$ 45,000
13	BLM	Virgin River Valley	Kusler Property	\$ 120,000



**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Acquired By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Land Acquisitions —Round 2</b>	<b>Amount</b>
14	NPS	Eldorado Canyon in Clark County	Eagle Mining Claims	\$ 136,000
15	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Rockefeller Mining Claims	\$ 149,000
16	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Horseshutem Springs	\$ 800,000
17	FS	Inyo National Forest	Pinchot Springs	\$ 200,000
18	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	White Beauty Mine	\$ 9,000,000
19	BLM	Humboldt County	Knott Creek Reservoir	\$12,600,000
20	BLM	South Virgin Mountains	Delavan Properties	\$ 865,000
21	FS	8 miles north of Ione	Idelwild Creek/Boy Scout	\$ 150,000
			<b>Total Land Acquisitions— Round 2</b>	<b>\$50,228,000</b>
			<b>Land Acquisitions—Round 3</b>	
1	BLM	Washoe County	Casey Ranch Surface Water	\$ 2,000,000
2	BLM	Clark County	Perkins Property	\$ 500,000
3	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Ravers Fishing Club Village	\$ 75,000
4	BLM	Washoe & Storey Counties	McCarran Ranch	\$ 500,000
5	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Capitol Camp Mining Claims	\$ 375,000
6	NPS	Lake Mead NRA	Moffitt	\$ 215,000
7	FS	Clark County	Nel Property	\$20,000,000
8	BLM	Clark County	Walking Box	\$ 1,000,000
9	FS	Clark County	Cabin Springs	\$ 200,000
10	FS	Clark County	Harris Springs	\$ 516,000
11	FS	Washoe County	Ballardini Ranch	\$15,000,000
12	FS	Spring Mountains NRA	Mule Springs	\$ 800,000
13	BLM	Red Rock Canyon NCA	Milon Inc/Tiberti	\$ 3,000,000
			<b>Total Round 3 Land Acquisitions</b>	<b>\$44,181,000</b>

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Acquired By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Land Acquisitions—Round 3 Supplementals</b>	<b>Amount</b>
1	BLM	Clark County	Alamo Property (Muddy River)	\$ 670,000
2	BLM	Clark County	Warm Springs Ranch (Muddy River)	\$ 6,120,000
3	FS	Clark County	Schkade Property	\$ 237,000
4	FS	Clark County	Schkade Property	\$ 1,875,000
			<b>Total Land Acquisitions—Round 3 Supplementals</b>	<b>\$ 8,902,000</b>
			<b>Land Acquisitions—Round 4</b>	
1	FWS	Nye County	Ash Meadows TNC 38	\$ 85,000
2	FS	Clark County	Bunker Deer Creek	\$ 290,000
3	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 1	\$ 194,000
4	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 2	\$ 194,000
5	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 3	\$ 214,000
6	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 4	\$ 224,000
7	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 5	\$ 289,000
8	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 6	\$ 194,000
9	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 7	\$ 194,000
10	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 8	\$ 174,000
11	FS	Clark County	Deer Creek 9	\$ 237,000
12	FS	Washoe County	Casey E	\$ 1,500,000
13	FS	Clark County	Tillman Deer Creek	\$ 500,000
14	BLM	Washoe County	Winnemucca Ranch Road	\$ 400,000
15	FS	Humboldt County	Nevada First	\$ 4,324,600
16	FWS	Nye County	Ash Meadows TNC 27	\$ 45,000
17	BLM	Washoe County	Falcon Capital Casey**	\$22,250,000
18	FS	Washoe County	West Truckee	\$ 1,305,020
19	FS	Carson City County	Steidley	\$ 222,000
20	BLM	Carson City	Carson River Bernhard Property	\$ 1,300,000

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Acquired By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Land Acquisitions—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
21	FS	Washoe County	Canepa Ranch	\$2,186,688
22	BLM	Washoe	Home Camp	\$3,500,000
23	FS	Nye	Arcularius	\$ 120,000
24	FS	Douglas	Jacks Creek	\$1,270,000
25	BLM	Nye	Lockes Ranch	\$1,049,000
26	FS	Elko	Greys Lake	\$ 178,000
27	BLM	Carson City	Carson River Howard Property	\$ 154,920
28	BLM	Carson City	Carson River Dombrowski Property	\$ 201,000
29	FS	Washoe	Weiner	\$2,000,000
30	FS	Washoe	Peavine West (Canepa)	\$2,070,000
31	FS	Carson City	Gilbert	\$1,000,000
32	BLM	Elko	Rock Creek	\$3,118,930
33	FS	Douglas	Lahrens	\$ 390,000
34	FS	Washoe	Bowers Mansion Property	\$ 820,000
35	FS	Elko	Clover Valley Two	\$2,202,000
36	FS	Douglas	Hussman	\$ 575,000
37	BLM	Lyon	H Bar C	\$ 250,000
38	BLM	Douglas	Carson Valley Conservation Easement Group A	\$5,350,000
39	BLM	Esmeralda	Chiatovich Creek	\$3,753,500
40	BLM	Douglas	Carson Valley Conservation Easement Group B	\$2,800,000
41	FS	Washoe	Urrutia-Poeville	\$ 611,000
42	BLM	Elko	Clover Valley One	\$1,100,000
43	BLM	Douglas	Carson Valley Conservation Easement Group C	\$4,200,000
44	FS	Douglas	Water Canyon One	\$ 550,000
45	FS	Douglas	Water Canyon Two	\$ 290,000
46	BLM	Washoe	Heinz Ranch	\$ 131,250
47	BLM	Lyon	O’Callaghan River Ranch Conservation Easement	\$1,120,000
48	FS	Carson City	Swafford	\$1,355,000

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Acquired By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Land Acquisitions—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
49	BLM	Douglas	Carson Valley Conservation Easement Group D	\$ 5,200,000
50	FS & BLM	Elko	IL Ranch Appraisal (400 parcels)	\$ 20,000,000
			<b>Total Land Acquisitions—Round 4</b>	<b>\$101,681,908</b>
			<b>Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan for Clark County—Round 2</b>	<b>Amount</b>
1			MSHCP FY 2001 & FY 2002	\$ 4,648,334
			<b>Total MSHCP for Clark County—Round 2</b>	<b>\$ 4,648,334</b>
	<b>Proponent</b>		<b>Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan for Clark County—Round 4</b>	
1	NPS	Clark County	Songbird Monitoring as a tool for guiding Habitat Restoration at Lake Mead NRA	\$ 118,000
2	NPS	Clark County	Relict Leopard Frog Monitoring and Management	\$ 182,850
3	FS	Clark County	SMNRA Landscape Assessment	\$ 2,388,386
4	FS	Clark County	Inventory and Monitoring of rare plant species on the SMNRA	\$ 90,513
5	NPS	Clark County	Wildlife Inventory Monitoring and Management	\$ 239,108
6	NPS	Clark County	Temperature Acclimation and Oxygen Consumption of Rana Onca larvae	\$ 48,450
7	NPS	Clark County	Evaluation of the impact of Vegetation Encroachment on Relict Leopard Frog populations	\$ 145,526
8	NPS	Clark County	Lake Mead NRA Data Collection and Analysis	\$ 221,950
9	UNR, Reno BRRC	Clark County	Baseline Density Monitoring: Southern Nevada Desert Wildlife Management Area populations of the Desert	\$ 810,000
10	TNC	Clark County	Relict Leopard Frog Recovery Strategy	\$ 35,000
11	Partners in Conservation	Clark County	Second Phase of PIC	\$ 297,000

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan for Clark County—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
12	SNWA	Clark County	Investigation of Bat Species Diversity and Distribution along the Las Vegas Wash	\$ 35,797
13	SNWA	Clark County	Investigation of Amphibian Diversity and Distribution along the Las Vegas Wash	\$ 27,810
14	UNR, Reno BRRC	Clark County	Translocation long-term monitoring, tortoise density evaluation, and establishment of new LSTSs	\$162,000
15	NPS	Clark County	The effects of Athel ( <i>Tamarix aphylla</i> ) on riparian habitats	\$ 60,000
16	NPS	Clark County	Floristic Survey of Select Springs along the Colorado River below Hoover Dam	\$ 37,950
17	NPS	Clark County	Factors affecting rarity of the Las Vegas Bearpoppy	\$ 60,000
18	NPS	Clark County	Lake Mead NRA Monitoring of Ground Disturbance; Illegal Tracks and Traces	\$ 50,600
19	Partners in Conservation	Clark County	Development of Intensive PIE Program Targeting Preteen, Teenage OHV Users	\$ 77,000
20	TNC	Clark County	Plant Conservation Plan for Clark County	\$113,100
21	NPS	Clark County	An Evaluation of the Non-Vascular Plants of Concern in Clark County	\$ 30,340
22	USDA Animal Damage Control	Clark County	Provide assistance in the development and application of Wildlife Damage Management for the protection of identified threatened and/or endangered species from predation or parasitism within Clark County	\$ 91,418
23	Clark County	Clark County	Cooperative Weed Management Program Development	\$126,500
24	BLM	Clark County	Ecological Inventory for the Spring Mountains Ecosystem	\$885,170
25	BLM	Clark County	Development of a Designated Roads Network in the NE Desert Tortoise Desert Wildlife Management Areas	\$148,000

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan for Clark County—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
26	Partners in Conservation	Clark County	Development of Desert Conservation Week as Educational Pilot Program	\$ 20,500
27	USDA Agricultural Research Service	Clark County	Pollinator Ecology	\$ 208,611
28	BLM	Clark County	Virgin River conservation Strategy Plan	\$2,022,350
29	BLM	Clark County	GIS Support	\$ 390,600
30	BLM	Clark County	Evaluating Impacts of Cattle Grazing on Vegetation and Vegetative Recovery following removal of cattle	\$ 160,200
31	NPS	Clark County	Vegetation Monitoring Program: Rare Plants, Plant Poaching, and Weed Management Programs	\$ 642,270
32	NDF	Unknown	DCP Forester Position - Extension	\$ 45,974
33	BLM	Clark County	Integrated Mesquite-Acacia Conservation Strategy Plan	\$ 128,100
34	UNR, Reno BRRC	Clark County	Red Rocks to the Summit (RRTTS)	\$ 447,600
35	Clark County	Clark County	Meadow Valley Wash Riparian Habitat Conservation Management Plan	\$ 100,000
36	Clark County	Clark County	Clark County PIE - Mojave Education Project	\$ 260,000
37	Clark County	Clark County	Clark County PIE - Strategic Planning and Program Assessment	\$ 106,000
38	Clark County	Clark County	Conservation Management Plan Development	\$ 500,000
39	UNR, Reno BRRC	Clark County	Ecosystem Indicators	\$ 583,000
40	FS	Clark County	Bat Inventories of the Spring Mountains	\$ 44,000
41	FS	Clark County	Peregrine Falcon Nesting Survey of the Spring Mountains	\$ 9,000
42	FS	Clark County	All Bird Monitoring Program in Clark County, Nevada	\$ 88,300

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan for Clark County—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
43	FS	Clark County	Northern Goshawk Survey of the Spring Mountains and other suitable nesting areas in Clark County	\$ 40,080
44	Clark County	Clark County	Desert NWARA/Developed Community Interface Inventory and Assessment	\$ 100,000
45	FS	Clark County	Butterfly monitoring in the Spring Mountains	\$ 11,000
46	Clark County	Clark County	Clark County MSHCP Administration	\$ 250,000
47	TNC	Clark County	Muddy River Interim Management Plan Development and Partner Coordination	\$ 177,147
48	Clark County	Clark County	Clark County MSHCP Adaptive Management Coordination, Science Advice and Effectiveness Monitoring Strategy Development	\$ 1,593,015
			<b>Total MSHCP for Clark County—Round 4</b>	<b>\$14,410,215</b>
	<b>Nominated By</b>		<b>Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas—Round 1</b>	
1	Clark County	Clark County	Clark County Wetlands Park	\$ 4,200,000
			<b>Total Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas—Round 1</b>	<b>\$ 4,200,000</b>
	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Parks, Trails and Natural Areas—Round 2</b>	
1	Boulder City	Boulder City	Regional Trail Link Between Bootleg Canyon and River Mountains Loop Trail	\$ 48,000
2	Las Vegas	Las Vegas	Las Vegas Springs Preserve Cienega/Wetlands	\$ 2,000,000
3	Henderson	Henderson	River Mountain Loop Trail	\$ 1,500,000
4	North Las Vegas	North Las Vegas	Multi-Use Pedestrian Pathway at the Las Vegas Wash	\$ 1,700,000
5	Clark County	Clark County Wetlands Park	Phase 2 Land Acquisition for Clark County Wetlands Park	\$ 2,700,000
10	Clark County	Las Vegas	Trail Head and Staging Area at Vegas Valley Drive & Hollywood Boulevard	\$ 500,000
			<b>Total Parks, Trails and Natural Areas—Round 2</b>	<b>\$ 8,448,000</b>

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

Priority	Nominated By	Location	Parks, Trails and Natural Areas—Round 3	Amount
1	Henderson	Henderson	Wetlands Trail Connection	\$ 300,000
2	Henderson	Henderson	Union Pacific RR Trail—Phase 1	\$ 1,350,000
3	Henderson	Henderson	St. Rose Parkway Trail and Landscaping—Phase 1	\$ 791,515
4	Henderson	Henderson	Boulder Highway Trail	\$ 500,000
5	Las Vegas	Las Vegas	Lone Mountain Trail	\$ 3,200,000
6	Henderson	Henderson	McCullough Trail Connection	\$ 2,100,000
7	Las Vegas	Las Vegas	Bonanza/US 95 Trail	\$12,100,000
8	North Las Vegas	North Las Vegas	Multi-use Western Tributary of the Las Vegas Wash Regional Trail	\$ 2,450,000
9	Clark County	Clark County	Flamingo Wash Trail—Phase 1	\$ 2,850,000
10	Clark County	Clark County	Wetlands Park Nature Preserve—Phase 2	\$ 2,900,000
11	Las Vegas	Las Vegas	90 Miles of Multi-Use Trails and Trail Heads Throughout Las Vegas	\$ 4,300,000
12	Las Vegas	Las Vegas	Las Vegas Wash Trail	\$ 1,920,000
13	Clark County	Clark County	Bootleg Canyon Park (Boulder City)	\$ 2,000,000
14	Henderson	Henderson	Union Pacific RR Trail—Phase 2	\$ 1,300,000
15	Las Vegas	Las Vegas	Equestrian Park	\$ 500,000
16	Henderson	Henderson	Open Space Plan	\$ 150,000
17	Clark County	Clark County	Pioneer's Trail (Regional Transportation Commission)	\$ 360,250
18	Las Vegas	Las Vegas	Centennial Hills Multi-use Trail Segments	\$ 740,000
			<b>Total Parks, Trails and Natural Areas—Round 3</b>	<b>\$39,811,765</b>
			<b>Parks, Trails and Natural Areas—Round 4</b>	
1	Clark County	Tropicana, Flamingo, Blue Diamond, and Red Rock Detention Basins	Tropicana and Flamingo Wash Recreation Project	\$ 4,450,000
2	Clark County	Clark County Wetlands Park	Wetlands Park Perimeter Trails	\$ 2,800,000



**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Parks, Trails and Natural Areas—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
3	City of Las Vegas	Las Vegas Springs Preserve	Las Vegas Springs Preserve Trails	\$5,000,000
4	Clark County	Ten miles from Logandale; State Route 169; Overton Wash	Logandale Trails - Phase 4	\$ 60,000
5	City of North Las Vegas	Carey Avenue west of Losee Road	Kiel Ranch Historic Site and Trailhead	\$2,400,000
6	Clark County	Clark County Wetlands Park	Wetlands Park Interpretive Plan Implementation	\$ 500,000
7	Clark County	Clark County Wetlands Park within Las Vegas Wash	Wetlands Park Land Acquisition	\$1,500,000
8	City of Henderson	Whitney Mesa Nature Preserve - Galleria Drive and Patrick Lane - Henderson	Whitney Mesa Nature Preserve	\$1,673,250
9	Clark County	Flamingo Wash and Flamingo Arroyo Trails	Flamingo Arroya Trail - Phase 2	\$2,500,000
10	Clark County	Clark County Wetlands Park	Wetlands Park Primary Trail Corridors	\$4,200,000
11	Clark County	Las Vegas Wash - Clark County Wetlands Park	Las Vegas Wash Environmental Restoration Project	\$2,000,000
12	Clark County	Duck Creek within Clark County Wetlands Park Nature Preserve	Duck Creek Habitat Restoration/Enhancement	\$2,600,000
13	City of North Las Vegas	Las Vegas Wash	Multi-Use Western Tributary of the Las Vegas Wash Regional Trail	\$3,900,000

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Parks, Trails and Natural Areas—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
14	Clark County	Northwest Las Vegas; Lone Mountain Planning Area	Lone Mountain Trail Development	\$ 150,000
15	City of Las Vegas	Centennial Hills Park	Prehistoric Riverbed Preservation	\$ 3,800,000
16	City of Henderson	St. Rose Parkway to Horizon Ridge Parkway - Henderson	Amargosa Trail	\$ 2,356,230
17	Clark County	Adjacent to State Route 170 between Bunkerville and Mesquite	Bunkerville Bike Path	\$ 865,000
18	City of North Las Vegas	Upper Las Vegas Wash	Right-of-Way acquisition for the Upper Las Vegas Wash for the Regional Trail System	\$ 500,000
19	City of Las Vegas	Not available	Lone Mountain Trail Trailhead	\$ 1,500,000
20	City of Henderson	Western edge of McCullough Mountains	Anthem East Trails	\$ 1,328,250
21	City of Henderson	Trail from Lake Mead Drive to River Mountains Loop Trail	Burkholder Trail	\$ 1,606,710
22	City of Las Vegas	Base of La Madre Mountain	La Madre Mountain Trailhead	\$ 3,900,000
23	City of Henderson	City of Henderson	Pittman Wash Trail	\$ 1,106,700
24	City of Henderson	City of Henderson	Cactus Wren Trail	\$ 577,500
25	City of Las North Vegas	Craig Ranch Golf Course	Regional Park (Craig Ranch Golf Course)	\$38,000,000
26	Clark County	Clark County Wetlands Park	Wetlands Park Equestrian and Emergency Access Bridge	\$ 800,000
27	Clark County	Clark County Wetlands Park	Sunrise Trailhead - Phase 2	\$ 300,000
28	City of Las Vegas	Centennial Hills Park	Centennial Hills Park Trail	\$ 440,000
			<b>Total Parks, Trails and Natural Areas—Round 4</b>	<b>\$90,813,640</b>

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Nominated By</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>SNPLMA Conservation Initiatives—Round 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
1	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	"Take Pride in America" in southern Nevada - A Local Litter and Desert Dumping Clean-up Program	\$ 3,299,000
2	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Cooperative Conservation: Increasing Capacity through Community Partnership	\$ 2,181,520
3	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Education in the Environment: Hands-on Student Research and Outdoor Learning Experiences	\$ 916,825
4	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Backcounty Access: A Recreation, Education and Conservation Program	\$ 6,691,900
5	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Resource Protection	\$ 6,454,000
6	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Intra-/Inter Agency Recreation Strategy	\$ 2,068,000
7	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Intra-/Inter Agency Science and Research Strategy	\$ 462,000
8	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Wild Horse & Burro Management	\$ 510,000
9	BLM	Clark County	Logandale Trail Gateway	\$ 745,000
10	NPS	Clark County	Meeting the Challenge of Water 2025 Initiative: Balancing Water Quality, Community Needs and Water-Based Recreation for Lake Mead and Lake Mohave	\$ 2,306,000
11	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Invasive Weed Removal and Habitat Restoration	\$ 5,295,000
12	BLM, NPS FWS, FS	Clark County	Off-Highway Vehicle Strategy	\$ 2,000,000
			<b>Total SNPLMA Conservation Initiatives—Round 4</b>	<b>\$32,929,245</b>

**Table 5.5 (continued)**

<b>SNPLMA Summary</b>	
<b>Totals By Category—Rounds 1, 2, 3, And 4</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Capital Improvements</b>	<b>\$141,517,712</b>
<b>Land</b>	<b>\$229,074,433</b>
<b>Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan</b>	<b>\$ 19,058,549</b>
<b>Parks, Trails And Natural Areas</b>	<b>\$143,273,405</b>
<b>Conservation Initiatives Round 4</b>	<b>\$ 32,929,245</b>
<b>10% Contingency and Previously Approved</b>	<b>\$ 29,252,041</b>
<b>Total Outdoor Recreation SNPLMA Funding</b>	<b>\$595,285,305</b>

Source: Adapted by James A. DeLoney from data provided by Michael Reiland, Gonzales Consulting Services, C/O Bureau of Land Management, 4701 N. Torrey Pines Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nevada 89130, on May 15, 2003. and November 18, 2003. Additional research by DeLoney at the <http://www.nv.blm.gov/snplma/financial.asp> website augment Reiland's data.

## **Coordination Between Governmental and Non-Governmental Entities**

According to the public comments received during the identification and prioritization of the eight outdoor recreation issues presented in Chapter 1 of this plan, the public wants governmental agencies to do a better job of coordinating and cooperating to provide the outdoor recreation opportunities in Nevada. Various levels of government in Nevada are involved in many cooperative ventures to provide outdoor recreation opportunities. The following examples illustrate a few of these cooperative efforts.

At the request of Governor Guinn to the Secretary of the Interior, state agencies in Nevada were invited by the BLM to participate in the planning process to develop the federally mandated Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area (NCA) Environmental Impact Statement/Resource Management Plan (DEIS/RMP). Local governmental entities, the Nevada Association of Counties, and the University of Nevada at Reno also participated in the DEIS/RMP development process.

At the request of the BLM, representatives from the Nevada Division of State Parks, Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), U.S. Forest Service, Nevada Division of Wildlife, BLM, and the motorized and environmental sectors served on a Subcommittee to develop draft Off-Highway Vehicle Standards and Guidelines for use in the management of BLM owned lands in Nevada. The Subcommittee submitted the draft

guidelines to three BLM Resource Advisory Committees. The RAC's approved the guidelines and submitted them to the BLM director for consideration. The acting BLM director approved the guidelines and disseminated them to the BLM staff on August 6, 2003, for use in their planning and management efforts.

Implementation of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA) requires extensive cooperation and coordination between the Bureau of Land Management, other federal agencies, state agencies, local governmental entities, conservation organizations, and other entities. Parks, open spaces, natural areas, wetlands, trails, and other outdoor recreation lands are a major component of the SNPLMA.

Grant programs, such as the Recreational Trails Grant Program administered by the Nevada Division of State Parks, require extensive coordination and cooperation among governmental entities, user groups, and non-profit organizations. Much of this cooperation comes in the form of matching contributions to complete trails development and maintenance projects throughout Nevada. Trail projects occur on federal, state, and local governmental lands. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Nevada Department of Transportation Department (NDOT) guidelines make this program one of the easiest for Nevada to administer. For example, FHWA guidelines permit states to use seven percent of the state's allocation to administer the RecTrails Program. The process for the states to obtain the funds for administrative purposes only requires a brief letter to the FHWA Division Office in Nevada

requesting approval to use seven percent of the state's allocation to administer the program. The FHWA Division Office promptly sends a brief letter to the Nevada Division of State Parks approving the request. FHWA guidelines permit Nevada to allocate the grants to recipients via a rather simple application process. Grants may be awarded to non-profit and advocacy entities and private entities as well as governmental agencies. Recipients of grant awards only have to provide a 20% match of the project cost. These are just a few of the reasons the RecTrails Program is popular in Nevada. Funding recreational trails projects offer a means to address issue # 3 in this plan.

Coordination and cooperation between governmental and non-governmental entities offers some of the best prospects to improve outdoor recreational opportunities in Nevada. As the demand for outdoor recreation opportunities in Nevada continues to increase with the growing population, coordination and cooperation among the providers and users of outdoor recreation opportunities will become even more important.

### **Programmatic SCORP Implementation Issues**

The 1965 Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (Public Law 88-578) requires states to develop a Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) to be eligible to participate in the L&WCF Grant Program. Bill Spitzer, former assistant director of the National Park Service, addressing the National Association of Statewide Outdoor Recreation Resource Planners shortly before his retirement, compared SCORP planning with implementation.

Mr. Spitzer said that throughout the history of the L&WCF Program planning was the strong side of the SCORP program.

Mr. Spitzer said the weakness of SCORP's throughout the history of the L&WCF Program had always been implementation. One of the reasons for this weakness is that the 1965 L&WCF Act, as amended, does not give the states the authority to implement the SCORP's.

Participants in Nevada's 2003 SCORP planning process identified the top outdoor recreation issues in Nevada and the actions recommended to address those issues. Nevada's 2003 SCORP presents these issues and actions, pertinent outdoor recreation participation data, and other assessments.

The **L&WCF Grants-in-Aid Manual** requires each state to implement an open project selection process, a component of which is "a priority rating system for selecting projects that ensures the fair and equitable evaluation of all projects and at a minimum: Places the strongest possible emphasis on project selection criteria that conform directly to priority needs identified by the SCORP process" (Chapter 660.4, page 2). Nevada revised its Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) in 2003. Each project may be awarded up to 100 points for the "project relationship with 2003 SCORP issues." Each project may receive a maximum of 305 points.

Although Congress requires states to develop and maintain SCORP's to participate in the federal L&WCF Grants Program, federal agencies are not required to comply with the SCORP's. The lack of a requirement for federal

agencies to comply with the SCORP becomes even more significant in Nevada with 87% of the land in Nevada in federal ownership. Federal, state and local governmental entities, non-profit organizations, and outdoor recreation user groups are encouraged to utilize Nevada's 2003 SCORP to guide the acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation parks and areas in Nevada.

Adequately funding the stateside portion of the L&WCF program would greatly enhance SCORP implementation. For over 20 years, Congress has not adequately funded the stateside portion of the L&WCF Grants Program. Instead, Congress has allocated the bulk of the funds to federal agencies. From 1995-1999, states received no L&WCF funding. In FY 2003, Congress awarded federal agencies approximately five times as much as they awarded all of the states combined. Nevada's L&WCF apportionment declined from \$1.7 million in FY 2002 to \$1.12 million in 2003, a decline of 33% in one year. A stronger commitment by Congress to stateside funding would provide states a greater incentive and means to implement SCORP's.

Until the passage of Senate Bill 144 by the Nevada Legislature in 2003, the Nevada Division of State Parks absorbed the entire cost to administer the L&WCF Grants Program out of its staff and budgetary resources, which were already severely strained. By policy, half of the L&WCF moneys go to local entities in Nevada.

Amending the L&WCF Act to permit the NDSP to more easily recover its costs to administer the L&WCF Grants

Program would enable the agency to focus more on SCORP implementation. One model of how to amend the L&WCF Act can be found in the Recreational Trails Grant Program administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). FHWA guidelines make the RecTrails Program one of the easiest for states to administer. FHWA guidelines permit states to use seven percent of the available funds to administer the RecTrails Grant Program at the state level. In Nevada, this seven percent is used to pay the salary of the RecTrails Grant Program Manager and to cover operational costs, such as travel, computers, computer software, etc, used to administer the program. The paperwork required for the states to receive the seven percent for administrative purposes is very simple and easy to accomplish.

The L&WCF Grants Program would be greatly simplified if it would allow states to use a percentage of available funds for administrative purposes at the state level. In a letter dated April 1, 2002, from Mr. Michael D. Wilson, Chief, Recreation Programs Division, National Park Service in Washington, D.C., to Mr. Wayne Perock, Administrator, Nevada Division of State Parks, Mr. Wilson said, "Any suggestions and comments will be appreciated." Mr. Perock responded in part on June 4, 2002, by offering the following suggestion to improve the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program.

"Change the L&WCF legislation to permit states charged to administer the program to take 7% off the top of

the state's apportionment to administer the program.”

Budget shortfalls offer opportunities for cooperation among state and local agencies. Seven percent of Nevada's RecTrails Grant apportionment does not cover the state's entire administrative costs. Nevada will encounter deficits to pay the salary of the RecTrails Program Manager and to pay for operational costs to administer the RecTrails Grant Program. Funds were not available to develop the State Trails Plan, a requirement of Federal Highway Administration guidelines. Neither did Nevada have sufficient funds to develop, print, and distribute Nevada's 2003 SCORP.

States may apply for planning grants to defray costs to develop the SCORP under the provisions of the L&WCF Grants Manual. To delay the budget shortfalls Nevada will encounter to meet the federal requirements to administer these two federal grants programs, the National Park Service awarded the Nevada Division of State Parks a federal L&WCF planning grant in 2002 in the amount of \$66,596 in federal funds. This grant provides funds to partially defray costs to develop a Statewide Trails Inventory, a State Trails Plan, and the 2003 SCORP.

This is an example of how the NDSP is using available federal grant funds to comply with federal requirements to maintain Nevada's eligibility to participate in these two federal grant programs. Currently, about \$1.8 million is allocated annually to the state to provide recreational trails and park and recreation areas and facilities. This

funding arrangement is an example of coordination and cooperation between the State of Nevada and two federal agencies, the Federal Highway Administration and the National Park Service, to implement an issue (Issue # 3, Chapter 1) and actions (table 1.3) cited in Nevada's 2003 SCORP, and to address the FHWA requirements for the state to develop a State Trails Plan and L&WCF program requirements to develop a SCORP. The L&WCF grants program is also being used to implement other outdoor recreation issues in this plan.

In Mr. Perock's letter to Mr. Wilson cited above, Mr. Perock offered two more suggestions to improve the SCORP development process.

“Move the Wetlands Priority Component of the SCORP to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), or another appropriate agency.”

“Align SCORP due dates with the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE).”

Removing the Wetlands Plan as a SCORP requirement would reduce the workload on state agencies, usually state parks, to develop SCORP's, and place the Wetlands Plan in a more appropriate federal agency, and in turn, a more appropriate state agency. Aligning SCORP's with the NSRE would make the vast amounts of data collected through this survey available to states in a timely fashion for inclusion in SCORP updates. The integration of the NSRE into SCORP development is one of the greatest opportunities available for



federal-state cooperation and coordination. To successfully integrate the use of NSRE data into SCORP development, the NSRE data must be provided to the states in a format that the states can easily manipulate to conduct analysis of the data suited to each state's need. Prompt federal actions on these two recommendations would reduce federal requirements to develop future SCORP's and provide the NDSP a valuable source of timely data to improve future SCORP development.

## Conclusions

Nevada needs a strong impetus to address the outdoor recreation issues and actions needed to address those issues presented in chapter 1 of this plan. Two tasks could provide the impetus needed.

1. A state agency assume an active leadership role in the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities in Nevada.
2. Conduct a statewide outdoor recreation summit.

The 1997 **Nevada State Parks System Plan** reads as follows:

"The Division has set a set of goals and objectives which have been incorporated into a series of officially adopted policies. These policy statements are as follows: Provide leadership to ensure fulfillment of the peoples' need for recreation" (Nevada Division of State Parks. 1997, page 1-3.).

Although the Nevada Division of State Parks has had the above policy since 1997, the Division's ability to take an could be used to provide guidelines to plan a summit conference in Nevada.

active leadership role in recent years has been restricted due to severely limited staff and budgetary resources, according to Steve Weaver, Chief of Planning and Development, NDSP (Comment, July 2003). Responsibilities assigned the NDSP by the Nevada Legislature, such as development and maintenance of the State's Outdoor Recreation Plan; the acquisition, development, and maintenance of Nevada's State Parks; and the administration of the federal Recreational Trails and Land and Water Conservation Fund Grants Programs, make the NDSP the logical choice to assume an active leadership role in the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities described in this plan.

Addressing the idea of the Nevada Division of State Parks performing a leadership role in the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities in Nevada, David Morrow, Administrator, NDSP, stated that a leadership role is not a role that an agency simply assumes. It is a role that must be earned by actions (Morrow. 2003).

According to Dr. John L. Crompton, Distinguished Professor in the Parks, Recreation and Tourism Sciences Department at Texas A&M University, federal and state parks drive tourism (Personal communications). In Nevada, Crompton's assessment takes on additional importance with the amount of federal lands available for outdoor recreation activities. A statewide outdoor recreation summit could enhance tourism and the state's economy. Other states have conducted summit conferences on outdoor recreation. These summit conferences

As articulated throughout this plan, Nevada has a very strong natural resource base that can support the recreation needs of Nevadans and our out-of-state visitors. If implemented, the

two recommendations above could serve as catalysts to help Nevada realize its vast potential in the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities